Multipartite Composition of Contextuality Scenarios

Ana Belén Sainz and Elie Wolfe

Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St. N, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 2Y5.

January 19, 2017

arXiv:1701.05171v1 [quant-ph] 18 Jan 2017

Contextuality is a particular quantum phenomenon that has no analogue in classical probability theory. Given two independent systems, a natural question is how to represent such a situation as a single test space. In other words, how two contextuality scenarios combine into a joint one. Under the premise that the the allowed probabilistic models satisfy the No-Signalling principle, Foulis and Randall defined the unique possible way to compose two contextuality scenarios. A variety of possible composition methods exist, however, for composing strictly-more than two test spaces. Nevertheless, all these formally-distinct composition methods appear to give rise to observationally equivalent scenarios, in the sense that the different compositions all allow precisely the same sets of classical and quantum probabilistic models. This raises the question of whether this invariance-under-composition-method is a special property of classical and quantum probabilistic models, or if this invariance generalizes to other probabilistic models as well, without our particular focus being $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models. $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models are physically important, because $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models, when applied to scenarios constructed by a particular composition rule, coincide with the well-defined "Almost Quantum Correlations". In this work we see that different composition rules, however, give rise to scenarios with inequivalent allowed sets of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models. We find that the non-trivial dependence of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models of the choice of composition method is apparently an artifact of failure of certain composition rules to satisfy the principle of Local Orthogonality. We prove that $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models satisfy invariance-under-composition-method when the principle of Local Orthogonality is included as part of the composition rules.

Introduction

Contextuality is a phenomenon that starkly reveals the difference between quantum and classical mechanics. Indeed, Kochen and Specker [1] proved that quantum mechanics is incompatible with the assumption that measurement outcomes are determined by physical properties that do not depend on the measurement context. In this sense, classical

theory fails at reproducing the measurement statistics obtained from operating on certain quantum systems. The original work by Kochen and Specker opened the door to different formalisations of contextuality, such as the sheaf-theoretic approach pioneered by Abramsky and Brandenburger [2], the hypergraph-theoretic approach by Acín, Fritz, Leverrier and Sainz [3], the graph-theoretic approach of Cabello, Severini and Winter [4], and Spekkens' work on measurement and preparation contextuality [5, 6], among others.

In this work we will consider the phenomenon of contextuality as defined in [3], where a contextuality scenario (a.k.a. test space) refers to a specification of a collection of measurements which says how many possible outcomes each measurement has and which measurements have which outcomes in common. This allows us to study both the jointly-measurable observables approach [2] and the phenomenon of nonlocality [7] in a unified manner within a general family of scenarios. A contextuality scenario is hence defined by a hypergraph.

A main question in this framework is that of composition, i.e. given independent contextuality scenarios how to define the hypergraph that represents the joint state space. Among the different ways of composing, we focus on those where the probabilistic models allowed in the joint hypergraph respect the No Signalling principle. For the case of two scenarios, Foulis and Randall [9] were the first to propose a composition rule that satisfies such properties. For multipartite scenarios, however, there is more than one way to compose the individual hypergraphs in a consistent way [3], which form a hierarchical family of composition methods. A curious property they have is that the set of classical and quantum probabilistic models they give rise to are independent of the choice of composition. A natural question then is whether this is a general property of probabilistic models or a particular feature of these two.

On the other hand, the set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models has caught the attention of the community since they satisfy many quantum-like properties [8, 3]. Here, we ask whether these models are also observationally invariant under the family of composition methods. At first we will see that they are not, by constructing a counterexample. Then, we propose a variation of the family of composition rules which imposes not only No Signalling but also the Local Orthogonality principle [14], and show that here the composite scenarios are observationally equivalent for $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models as well.

A particular composition rule explored in this work includes the notion of completion scenario, which is in general a difficult problem to solve. Here we propose a new protocol to compute the completion of a hypergraph, which builds on the (now disproven) conjecture of [3].

1 Hypergraph formalism

In this section we review some basics on the hypergraph framework for contextuality [3].

A contextuality scenario [3] is defined as a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ whose vertices $v \in V$ correspond to the events in the scenario, i.e. the answers of the questions that can be asked to the system in the particular experimental setup. Each *event* represents an outcome obtained from a device after it receives some input or "measurement choice". The hyperedges $e \in E$ are sets of events representing all the possible outcomes given a particular measurement choice. The hypergraph approach assumes that every such

measurement set is complete, in the sense that if the measurement corresponding to e is performed, exactly one of the outcomes corresponding to $v \in e$ is obtained. Note that measurement sets may have non-trivial intersection; when an event appears in more than one hyperedge, this represents the idea that the two different operational outcomes should be thought of as equivalent.

A *probabilistic model* on a contextuality scenario is an assignment of a number to each of the events, $p : V \to [0, 1]$, which denotes the probability with which that event occurs when a measurement $e \ni v$ is performed. This definition assumes that in the set of experimental protocols we are interested in, the probability for a given outcome is independent of the measurement that is performed. Since the measurements are complete, every probabilistic model p over the contextuality scenario H satisfies the normalisation condition $\sum_{v \in e} p(v) = 1$ for every $e \in E$. The set of all possible probabilistic models on a contextuality scenario is denoted by $\mathcal{G}(H)$. In addition to imposing normalisation, the hyperedges also define the notion of orthogonality (a.k.a. exclusiveness) among events: v and w are orthogonal whenever there exists a hyperedge e that contains both.

Several sets of probabilistic models have been studied, depending on the nature of the system and the rule used to assign probabilities [3]. In Appendix A we include the definitions of classical and quantum probabilistic models, whose corresponding sets are denoted by $\mathcal{C}(H)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(H)$ respectively. Kochen and Specker [1] showed that there exist scenarios that admit quantum models but no classical models, i.e. $\mathcal{C}(H) \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}(H)$ for some H. This phenomenon is referred to as *contextuality*, and the set of classical models is also referred to as the set of *noncontextual models*.

In this work we primarily focus on a set of probabilistic models called $\mathcal{Q}_1(H)$, which is particular relaxation of the quantum set.

Definition 1. $\mathcal{Q}_1$ ***models*** *[3, 6.3.1]*
Let H be a contextuality scenario. An assignment of probabilities $p : V(H) \to [0, 1]$ is a $\mathcal{Q}_1$ model if and only if there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ upon which live some positive-semidefinite quantum state ρ and positive-semidefinite projection operators P_v associated to every $v \in V$ such that

$$1 = \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho)\,, \quad p(v) = \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho P_v)\ \forall v \in V(H), \quad \textit{and} \quad \sum_{v \in e} P_v \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}\ \forall e \in E(H). \tag{1}$$

The set of all these models is denoted $\mathcal{Q}_1(H)$.

The set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models is of physical importance due to its relationship to the set of "Almost-Quantum-Correlations" [8]. Indeed, the set of "Almost-Quantum-Correlations" is *defined* as the set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models when applied to specific composite contextuality scenarios [3]; we will comment on this connection further in next section.

2 Composition of contextuality scenarios

A natural question addressed in [3] is, given two independent systems, how to represent such a situation as a single scenario. In other words, how two such hypergraphs combine into a joint one. A particular property that we expect of this joint scenario is that

the allowed general probabilistic models[1] $\mathcal{G}$ satisfy the so called *No-Signalling* principle (NS), that is, that the single-party marginals of every probabilistic model ought to be well-defined. To make this statement more precise, let us denote by H_A the first scenario, with measurements labelled by x and outcomes by a, and by H_B the second scenario, with measurements and outcomes labelled by y and b respectively. Then, the desired property states that if $p(ab|xy) \in \mathcal{G}(H_{AB})$, where H_{AB} is the joint scenario, $\sum_b p(ab|xy)$ should not depend on y, and conversely $\sum_a p(ab|xy)$ should not depend on x.

One can use elementary linear algebra to check if a candidate composite hypergraph correctly captures the No-Signalling constraints. Conversely, one can check if the normalization of probability along a particular hyperedge in a composite hypergraph *follows* from local normalization and No-Signalling. A "good" composition protocol should give rise to hypergraphs which innately imply No-Signalling and normalization, and such that normalization of probability along all the composite-scenario hyperedge follows from No-Signalling. In practice, this is done by expressing hypergraphs as matrices with 0/1 entries, with rows corresponding to hyperedges and columns corresponding to vertices. Indeed, with a slight abuse of notation we hereafter denote the matrix representation of a hypergraph as $E(H)$, the list of hyperedges. In matrix representation, the row corresponding to a particular hyperedge is such that a "1" is assigned to a column if and only if the vertex corresponding to that column belongs to that particular hyperedge.

Any composite scenario $H_{\text{composite}} = \otimes H_i$, no matter the details of the composition protocol, will have a vertex set given by $V(H_{\text{composite}}) := \prod_i V(H_i)$. A general probabilistic model p is hence allowed in the scenario H if and only if $E(H) \cdot \vec{p} = \vec{1}$, where $\vec{p}_k = p(v_k)$ and $\vec{1}$ is a vector of all ones. A hypergraph correctly[2] captures the desired normalization and no-signalling properties if and only if the reduced row echelon form of $M_{\text{normalization}} \cup M_{\text{no-signalling}}$ – both defined below – is the same as the reduced row echelon form of the hypergraph's matrix representation. Formally $\otimes_i H_i$ is a valid composition if and only if

$$\text{rref}(E(\otimes H_i)) = \text{rref}(M_{\text{normalization}} \cup M_{\text{no-signalling}}). \tag{2}$$

The **composite normalization matrix** $M_{\text{normalization}}$ is defined as follows. A row in $M_{\text{normalization}}$ consists of 0/1 entries, such that the rows in $M_{\text{normalization}}$ are effectively hyperedges, which we denote the *normalization hyperedges*. $M_{\text{normalization}}$ is designed to capture normalization of composite vertex sets based on normalization of the local vertex sets. A normalization hyperedge has a vertex set $\prod_i v_i \in e_{k_i}$ for some fixed set of local hyperedges $e_{k_i} \in E_i \; \forall_i$. The full normalization matrix is constructed by considering every possible tuple of local hyperedges.

The **composite No-Signalling matrix** $M_{\text{no-signalling}}$ is defined as follows. A row in $M_{\text{no-signalling}}$ consists of -1/0/+1 entries. Each row in $M_{\text{no-signalling}}$ captures a no-signalling equality, thus that $M_{\text{no-signalling}} \cdot \vec{p} = \vec{0}$. Given a composite scenario of N state spaces H_j, $j = 1 \ldots N$, a no-signalling equality is parameterized by

(i) the choice of a local scenario H_k,

(ii) the choice of some pair of hyperedges in that scenario, $e_k^1, e_k^2 \in E(H_k)$,

[1] The general models associated with contextuality scenarios are known, in nonlocality literature, as general probabilistic theory (GPT) correlations.

[2] The composite hypergraph must *not* impose any restrictions on general probabilistic models captured *aside* from normalization and no-signalling.

(iii) the choice of some fixed local vertices $v_j \in V(H_{j\neq k})$, one for each of the local scenarios other than H_k.

Given (i) – (iii), a no-signalling equality reads

$$\sum_{v_k \in e_k^1 \setminus e_k^2} p(v_1, \dots v_N) = \sum_{v_k \in e_k^2 \setminus e_k^1} p(v_1, \dots v_N). \tag{3}$$

which reduces to

$$\sum_{v_k \in e_k^1} p(v_1, \dots v_N) = \sum_{v_k \in e_k^2} p(v_1, \dots v_N)$$

for the special case of local hypergraphs with no intersecting hyperedges, as is the case of Bell scenarios.

From Eq. (3), such a no-signalling inequality translates into a row in $M_{\text{no-signalling}}$ as follows: any column labelled by the events $\{v_1, \dots v_N\}_{v_k \in e_k^1 \setminus e_k^2}$ is assigned a $+1$, while any column labelled by the events $\{v_1, \dots v_N\}_{v_k \in e_k^2 \setminus e_k^1}$ is assigned a -1. The remaining columns are assigned a 0 each. The full no-signalling matrix is constructed by considering every possible choice in (i) – (iii).

It is possible for two inequivalent hypergraphs to nevertheless have coinciding reduced row echelon forms of their matrix representation. Whenever two hypergraphs imply precisely the same set of general probabilistic model we say that they are equivalent under **completion**. The completion of a hypergraph, which we denote with overline, is the largest collection of hyperedges - i.e. rows made up only of zeroes and ones in matrix notation - such that the reduced row echelon is preserved. Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{H} :=& H' \text{ such that } \operatorname{rref}(E(H')) = \operatorname{rref}(E(H)) \\ & \text{and } \nexists_{e \notin E(H')} \text{ such that } \operatorname{rref}(E(H') \cup e) = \operatorname{rref}(E(H')). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Checking if a hypergraph is self-complete appears to be a difficult computational task, and the authors are not aware of any reasonable computational algorithm for constructing the completion of an incomplete hypergraph. In this work we will always refer to $\overline{H}$ as an abstract idea, never as an explicit construction. Note that a sufficient criterion for H_1 and H_2 to have the same completion is $E(H_1) \subseteq E(H_2)$ together with $\operatorname{rank}(E(H_1)) = \operatorname{rank}(E(H_2))$. The idea of hypergraph completion is further discussed in Appendix D.

How to explictly construct a joint scenario H_{AB} from two individual ones H_A and H_B in such a manner as to correctly capture no-signalling and normalization was elegantly solved by Foulis and Randall [9], via their Foulis-Randall product: $H_{AB} = {H_A}^{\text{FR}} \otimes H_B$. Although we will consider of a variety of distinct protocols for composing multiple ($n > 2$) individual ones, it is important to note that almost[3] the entire plethora of multipartite composition methods reduce to precisely the same protocol when considering ($n = 2$), namely the unambiguous bipartite FR-product, whose definition is presented in Appendix B.

The result by Foulis and Randall, however, is not the ultimate answer to the problem, because the FR-product is not associative when considering more than two contextuality scenarios. Different associative extensions of ${}^{\text{FR}}\otimes$ were explored in [3], Appendix C. In this work we will comment primarily on five (associative) composition protocols

[3]The bipartite FR product is not equal to its own completion if any of the local hypergraphs are themselves incomplete, i.e. $\overline{{H_A}^{\text{FR}} \otimes H_B} \neq {H_A}^{\text{FR}} \otimes H_B$ if $\overline{H_A} \neq H_A$ or $\overline{H_B} \neq H_B$. We conjecture, however, that $\overline{{H_A}^{\text{FR}} \otimes H_B} = {H_A}^{\text{FR}} \otimes H_B$ if $\overline{H_A} = H_A$ and $\overline{H_B} = H_B$, such as is locally the case for Bell scenarios.

1. the *minimal* FR-product, denoted ${}^{\min}\otimes$,
2. the *common* FR-product, denoted ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$,
3. the *maximal* FR-product, denoted ${}^{\max}\otimes$,
4. the *disjunctive* FR-product, ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$,
5. and the *completed* FR-product, $\overline{\otimes}$,

all of which are defined in Appendix C.

Each choice of product in the list above induces some hypergraph, which form a hierarchy of equivalent-under-completion hypergraphs, as proven in Appendix C. Formally,

$$E({}^{\min}\otimes H_i) \subseteq E({}^{\text{comm}}\otimes H_i) \subseteq E({}^{\max}\otimes H_i) \subseteq E({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i) \subseteq E(\overline{\otimes H_i}) \tag{5}$$

and at the same time

$$\text{rank}(E(\overline{\otimes H_i})) = \text{rank}(E({}^{\min}\otimes H_i)), \tag{6}$$

thereby indicating the equivalence of all five composition protocols under completion.

The representation of Bell scenarios as contextuality scenarios depends, of course, on the choice of product, although no ambiguity arises unless the Bell scenario consists of at least three parties. We will denote the hypergraph representation of a Bell scenario by $\mathcal{B}^{prod}_{n,m,d} = (V, E)$, where n is the number of parties, m the number of measurements they choose from, d the number of outcomes those measurements have, and *prod* the choice of hypergraph product. As far as general models, classical models, and even quantum models are concerned, the choice or product is totally irrelevant. That is,

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{G}(\overline{\mathcal{B}_{n,m,d}}) \tag{7}$$

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathcal{B}_{n,m,d}}) \tag{8}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}(\overline{\mathcal{B}_{n,m,d}}). \tag{9}$$

pursuant to [3, Thm. C.2.4]. For such models, all choices of product give rise to *observationally* equivalent scenarios.

Invariance under choice of product cannot be expected for all models, however. In particular, we will show that $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models are observationally distinct for the minimal product and the common product. Indeed, we explicitly confirm that

$$\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2}) \neq \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{3,2,2}). \tag{10}$$

On the other hand, we will prove that $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models are invariant relative to the choice of ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$, ${}^{\max}\otimes$, or ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$,[4] i.e.

$$\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d}). \tag{11}$$

An important motivation to study $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models is that the set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models coincides with that of the "Almost-Quantum-Correlations" [8] for the joint scenario generated by ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$, ${}^{\max}\otimes$, or ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$ [3, Sec. 6.4]. In section 3 we will see that $\mathcal{Q}_1$ does depend on the choice of product, although in section 4 we argue that new composition rules based on the Local Orthogonality principle render the joint scenarios observationally equivalent as well as far as $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models are concerned.

[4] For the special case of Bell scenario hypergraph representations, it appears that the *disjunctive* FR-product may coincide with the *completed* FR-product. We conjecture extending the invariance of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models to include $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{\mathcal{B}_{n,m,d}}) \overset{\text{conjecture}}{=} \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d})$ simply by virtue of $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{n,m,d}} \overset{\text{conjecture}}{=} \mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d}$ (see Conj. 1).

3 $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models in multipartite composite systems

In this section we show that the set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models may depend on the choice of multipartite product, i.e. the choice of composition protocol. The bipartite case is mostly (but not entirely) trivial, because in that case the composite hypergraphs pursuant to any protocol ${}^{\min}\otimes$ through ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$ all coincide. Obviously, if two product choices both yield the same exact scenario, they will also yield the same set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models, trivially. We therefore begin by exploring the next simplest case, namely three parties. We consider those Bell scenarios where each of the three parties has two disjoint dichotomic measurements, i.e. Bell scenarios which are product-choice-dependent but are of the family $\mathcal{B}^{prod}_{3,2,2}$.

Before showing product-choice dependence, however, note that the choices of composition methods between (and including) the common product and the disjunctive product are *observationally equivalent* under the set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models. That is,

$$\mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{comm}}\otimes ...) = \mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes ...) \tag{12}$$

holds in general, even for arbitrary individual contextuality scenarios, i.e. the invariance of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models under such products is not limited to Bell scenario. The proof is as follows: $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models are charecterized entirely by the orthogonality graph associated with a given contextuality scenario [3]. Different contextuality scenarios, i.e. different hypergraphs, can have the same associated orthogonality graph. The orthogonality graph is computed by a hypergraph as follows: Every node in the hypergraph is a node in the orthogonality graph, and two vertices are adjacent in the orthogonality graph if and only if both vertices appear in a common hyperedge in the hypergraph. Per [3], $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models can be characterised via the weighted Lovasz number of the *non*orthogonality graph. Note now that all composition methods between the common product and the disjunctive product yield the same orthogonality graph, namely the orthogonality graph that follows from the principle of Local Orthogonality [14], as discussed in Appendix C. Given that, it follows that all such composition methods allow precisely the same set of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models.

To positively illustrate nontrivial product-choice dependence for $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models we therefore focus our efforts on finding a difference between the minimal product $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{min}_{3,2,2})$ and the common product $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{comm}_{3,2,2})$. Firstly note that, regardless of the choice of product, $\mathcal{B}^{prod}_{3,2,2}$ has 64 vertices, which correspond to the eight different possible joint-measurement outcomes for each of the eight different possible (fixed) multipartite measurement contexts. The different product choices nevertheless lead to distinct hypergraphs:

- $\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2}$ has **176** hyperedges,
- $\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{3,2,2}$ has **488**,
- $\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{3,2,2}$ has **680**,
- $\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{3,2,2}$ has **744**.

Lacking a constructive protocol to generate the completion, the authors cannot be sure how many hyperedges the completion has, although we conjecture that

Conjecture 1. $\overline{\otimes H_i} \overset{conjecture}{=} {}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i \quad if \quad \forall_i : \text{OrthoGraph}(H_i) = \text{OrthoGraph}(\overline{H_i})$.
In other words, the disjunctive protocol is conjectured be self-complete whenever the local hypergraphs satisfy the property of orthogonality-graph-invariance-under-completion.

If true, the conjecture would imply that $\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{n,m,d} = \overline{\mathcal{B}_{n,m,d}}$. As an aside, the very fact that $\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{3,2,2} \neq \mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{3,2,2}$ shows that Conj. C.2.6 in Ref. [3] is false.

All four explicitly-constructed hypergraphs $\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{3,2,2}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{3,2,2}$, and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{3,2,2}$ have 64 vertices. Since we always have a hierarchy of hypergraphs per Eq. (5), we also always have a hierarchy of allowed probabilistic models, namely $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{\otimes} H_i) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\max}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{comm}}\otimes H_i) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\min}\otimes H_i)$.

Our first novel result is that $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d})$ allows strictly more $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models than the other composition protocols. This can be witnessed by computing the maximization of the Guess Your-Neighbour's-Input linear function[5] [11] by $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models in the different composite scenarios. While the supremum of this linear function is unity in $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{3,2,2})$, we found that in $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2})$ the linear function could be maximized all the way to 1.15636. We also probed additional Bell inequalities, i.e. maximizing different linear functions under both $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{3,2,2})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2})$, and we frequently witnessed a similar gap between the two maxima. The results are tabulated in Appendix E.

This case study shows that sometimes $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{H}) \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}_1(H)$, because in our example $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2})$ was found to be strictly larger than $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{\mathcal{B}_{3,2,2}})$, and $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{3,2,2}}$ is the completion of $\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{3,2,2})$. We should intuit that this is the case in general, namely we expect the following fairly-strong conjecture to be true:

Conjecture 2. $\mathcal{Q}_1(H_1) \overset{\textit{conjecture}}{\neq} \mathcal{Q}_1(H_2)$ *whenever* $\text{OrthoGraph}(H_1) \neq \text{OrthoGraph}(H_2)$, *even if* $\overline{H_1} = \overline{H_2}$. *In other words, two contextuality scenario should admit different* $\mathcal{Q}_1$ *models if the two scenario do not have the same associated orthogonality graph, even if the two scenarios are equivalent under completion.*

Evidence for this conjecture is presented in in Appendix F, where we contrast a contextuality scenario consisting of 8 hyperedges with its completion, which has 12 hyperedges, such that the two hypergraphs have different orthogonality graphs. We show that for the Bell inequality (24), correlations in $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{H})$ achieve a maximum value of 1.02325, whereas those in $\mathcal{Q}_1(H)$ reach 1.15324.

4 $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models and the Local Orthogonality principle

In the previous section we have noted that although different composition methods are observationally equivalent as far as classical, quantum, and general probabilistic models are concerned, nevertheless $\mathcal{Q}_1$ probabilistic models are *not* observationally invariant between some of these compositions. We now discuss how the dependence of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models on the choice of composition rule is related to the Local Orthogonality principle [14].

In the hypergraph formalism [3], two events v and w are *orthogonal* (a.k.a *exclusive*) whenever there exists a hyperedge $e \in E(H)$ that contains both vertices, i.e. $\{v, w\} \subseteq e$. Now, consider a composite contextuality scenario $H_{1\ldots n}$, where, for the moment, we have not specified the particular way of composing the individual scenarios H_k, $k = 1 \ldots n$. Given two events in the composite scenario $v, w \in V(H_{1\ldots n})$ a natural question is to ask if the pair of (composite) events are orthogonal. Per the standard defiinition of orthogonality, the orthogonality of compositive events depends entirely on the particular hyperedge set of $H_{1\ldots n}$. From an operational perspective, however, one would also expect two events to be orthogonal whenever they are *locally orthogonal* (LO) [14].

[5] Maximizing a linear function is equivalent to ascertaining the maximum violation of a linear inequality.

Local orthogonality specifies the orthogonality of composite events in the following fashion: Let $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ and $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ be two events in the joint scenario, labelled by the events in the individual ones. Then, if there exists a party k such that v_k and w_k are orthogonal in their individual contextuality scenario, then the two events v and w should be regarded as orthogonal in the joint scenario as well.

Note that whenever the composite scenario $H_{1\ldots n}$ has a hyperedge set subsuming the common product, i.e. $E(H_{1\ldots n}) \supseteq E({}^{\text{comm}}\otimes_k H_k)$, then LO is automatically imposed by the standard definition of exclusivity. Therefore, imposing the LO principle neither changes the orthogonality graph nor the set of allowed $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models. On the other hand, however, the composite scenario that arises from the minimal FR product does *not* automatically impose LO.[6] Therefore, one possibility is to equip the compositions rules of a product with constraints that impose LO *ad-hoc*. The joint scenario that arises from such an ad-hoc-modified composition method has the following property by construction: it gives rise to the same the orthogonality graph as would ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$. We find that by manually supplementing the composition rules so as to satisfy LO, the apparent observational inequivalence of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models of under ${}^{\text{min}}\otimes$ and ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$ disappears, such that rather $\mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{min,LO}}\otimes_k H_k) = \mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{max}}\otimes_k H_k)$.

4.1 Towards a meaningful product

The work of [3] focused on products where the composite scenario allows for probabilistic models that respect the No-Signalling principle. Here we argue that, in addition, one should ask the composition rule to include the orthogonality relations that arise from the Local orthogonality principle. The ideal composition rule, therefore, should naturally impose local orthogonality relations in addition to the obvious prerequisites of normalization and no-signalling. We know of three possible constructive composition rules which meet these requirements, as well as associativity: ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$, ${}^{\text{max}}\otimes$, and ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$.

Per Conj. 1, we have speculated that the completion of *any* composition product – which are all known to have the same completion – is equal to precisely ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$, at least whenever the local contextuality scenarios are themselves complete. In other words, ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes_i \overline{H_i} \overset{\text{conjecture}}{=} \overline{{}^{\text{comm}}\otimes_i H_i}$. Bell scenarios fall into this class, i.e. the contextuality scenario of each individual party is complete. If self-completeness is a desired feature in a composition rule, this suggests the disjunctive protocol as an ideal candidate. If, however, minimality by hyperedge count is prioritized over self-completeness, then we are led to unambigously endorse the common FR product as the ideal associative protocol which innately satisfies local orthogonality in addition to correctly capturing no-signalling and normalization.

Conclusions

In this work we explore different ways to compose multipartite contextuality scenarios, and the sets of correlations allowed by the different composition rules. Classical, quantum and general probabilistic models are invariant under the choice of composition rule, but

[6] Moreover, local orthogonality fails to be satisfied automatically not just for the minimal FR product rule, but for any choice of associative product rule up-to-but-not-including the common FR product rule.

we have seen that this invariance does not extend to all other sets of models, as illustrated by $\mathcal{Q}_1$ models behaving different under $^{\min}\otimes$ than under $^{\text{comm}}\otimes$.

Such dependence on product choise disappears, however, as soon as we equip the composite scenarios with additional constraints, namely the orthogonality relations implied by the Local Orthogonality principle. This not only highlights the importance of LO, but arguably suggests a more correct way to define the composition of multipartite contextuality scenarios.

Acknowledgements

We thank Tobias Fritz for fruitful discussions and comments. This research was supported in part by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

References

[1] Simon Kochen and E. P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. 17, 59-87 (1967).
[2] Samson Abramsky and Adam Brandenburger, New J. Phys. 13(11), 113036 (2011).
[3] Antonio Acín, Tobias Fritz, Anthony Leverrier, Ana Belén Sainz, Comm. Math. Phys. 334(2), 533-628 (2015).
[4] A. Cabello, S. Severini and A. Winter, arXiv:1010.2163 (2010).
[5] Y-C Liang, R. W. Spekkens and H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rep. 506, issues 1-2, pp 1-39 (2011).
[6] R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A 71, 052108 (2005).
[7] John S. Bell. Physics 1, 195-200 (1964).
[8] M. Navascués, Y. Guryanova, M. J. Hoban and A. Acín, Nat. Comm. 6, 6288 (2015).
[9] D. J. Foulis and C. H. Randall, Interpretations and foundations of quantum theory, pp. 9 – 20 (1979).
[10] Ana Belén Sainz, Tobias Fritz, Remigiusz Augusiak, Jonatan Bohr Brask, Rafael Chaves, Anthony Leverrier and Antonio Acín, Phys. Rev. A 89, 032117 (2014).
[11] M. L. Almeida *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 230404 (2010).
[12] C. Śliwa, arXiv:quant-ph/0305190 (2003).
[13] James Vallins, Ana Belén Sainz and Yeong-Cherng Liang, arXiv:1608.05641 (2016).
[14] T. Fritz *et al.*, Nat. Comm. 4, 2263 (2013).
[15] R. Ramanathan, J. Tuziemski, M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 050401 (2016).

A Probabilistic models

Several sets of probabilistic models have been studied, depending on the nature of the system and the rule used to assign probabilities [3]. We do not aim to provide a full review in these notes, however we present below two important sets not defined in the main text.

Definition 2. ***Classical models*** *[3, 4.1.1]*
Let H be a contextuality scenario. An assignment of probabilities $p : V(H) \to [0, 1]$ is a classical model *if and only if it can be written as*

$$p(v) = \sum_{\lambda} q_\lambda p_\lambda(v), \tag{13}$$

where the weights q_λ and deterministic models p_λ satisfy

$$\sum_{\lambda} q_\lambda = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad p_\lambda(v) = \{0, 1\} \quad \forall\, v, \lambda. \tag{14}$$

The set of all these models is denoted $\mathcal{C}(H)$.

Definition 3. ***Quantum models*** *[3, 5.1.1]*
Let H be a contextuality scenario. An assignment of probabilities $p : V(H) \to [0, 1]$ is a quantum model if and only if there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ upon which live some positive-semidefinite quantum state ρ and positive-semidefinite projection operators P_v associated to every $v \in V$ such that

$$1 = \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho)\,, \quad p(v) = \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho P_v)\ \forall v \in V(H), \ \text{ and } \ \sum_{v \in e} P_v = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}\ \forall e \in E(H). \tag{15}$$

The set of all quantum models is the quantum set*, denote $\mathcal{Q}(H)$.*

In the case of Bell scenarios, this definition accords with the usual one of quantum correlations [3], meaning that each global measurement represented by the projectors $\{P_v\}_{v \in e}$ can consistently be expressed as a product of local projectors, one for each party, such that the projectors for different parties commute and are properly normalised. For instance, in a bipartite Bell scenario $P_{ab|xy} = P_{a|x} P_{b|y}$, where $[P_{a|x}, P_{b|y}] = 0$ for all a, b, x, y and $\sum_a P_{a|x} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (similarly $\sum_b P_{b|y} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$).

B The Foulis-Randall Product of Two Contextuality Scenarios

In this section we review the way that Foulis and Randall [9] compose two hypergraphs, as well as various possible associative extensions to multipartite scenarios.

Definition 4. *[9] The* Foulis-Randall product *(*FR-product*) is the scenario ${H_A}^{\mathrm{FR}} \otimes H_B$ with*

$$V(H_A \otimes H_B) = V(H_A) \times V(H_B), \qquad E(H_A \otimes H_B) = E_{A \to B} \cup E_{A \leftarrow B}$$

where

$$E_{A \to B} := \left\{ \bigcup_{a \in e_A} \{a\} \times f(a) \ : \ e_A \in E_A,\ f : e_A \to E_B \right\}, \tag{16}$$

$$E_{A \leftarrow B} := \left\{ \bigcup_{b \in e_B} f(b) \times \{b\} \ : \ e_B \in E_B,\ f : e_B \to E_A \right\}. \tag{17}$$



(a) Single party Bell scenario

(b) CHSH scenario.

Figure 1: (a) The contextuality scenario $B_{1,m,d}$, a 'Bell scenario' with only one party [3, Fig. 5]. (b) Foulis-Randall product: the CHSH scenario $B_{2,2,2} = {B_{1,2,2}}^{\mathrm{FR}} \otimes B_{1,2,2}$ [3, Fig. 7], Fig. 7.

As an example, consider the situation where we have two parties, Alice and Bob, each perform space-like separated local actions on their share of a system. Locally, each party is characterised by the contextuality scenario of Fig. 1(a), i.e. a hypergraph consisting of m non-intersecting hyperedges (where m is the number of possible measurements the parties choose from) each encompassing d vertices (i.e. the number of outcomes each measurement has). If we denote each such scenario by H_A and H_B, the hypergraph to represent the joint situation is ${H_A}^{\mathrm{FR}} \otimes H_B$ (see Fig. 1(b)). At first one could think such a choice to be arbitrary, but actually it is this choice of product that guarantees that the probabilistic models allowed in the joint scenario H_{AB} satisfy the No Signalling principle (NS); in other words, the set of probabilistic models $\mathcal{G}(H_{AB})$ coincides with the bipartite nonsignalling polytope. Indeed, constraint (16) imposes NS from Bob to Alice, and constraint (17) NS from Alice to Bob.

C Composition Protocols for Multipartite Contextuality Scenarios

The FR product, however, is not associative, and hence cannot be used to tackle the problem of multipartite composition of contextuality scenarios. Different multipartite extensions were explored in [3], and in what follows we review three extensions from Ref. [3]: The *minimal* FR-product, the *common* FR-product, and the *maximal* FR-product. We also introduce a new composition protocol we call the *disjunctive* FR-product.

Definition 5. ***Minimal FR product*** *[3, 3.3.2]*
The minimal Foulis-Randall product ${}^{\min}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i$ *has vertices*

$$V\left({}^{\min}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i\right) := \prod_i V(H_i) = V(H_1) \times \ldots \times V(H_n),$$

and $\bigcup_k E_k$ *as its set of edges, where the elements of* E_k *indexed by party* $k = 1, \ldots, n$ *are of the form*

$$\{\, (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \mid v_i \in e_i \; \forall i \neq k,\; v_k \in f(\vec{v}) \,\} \tag{18}$$

for some edge $e_i \in E(H_i)$ for every party $i \neq k$ and a function $\vec{v} \mapsto f(\vec{v})$ which assigns to every joint outcome $\vec{v} = (v_1, \ldots, \cancel{v_k}, \ldots, v_n)$ of all parties except k an edge $f(\vec{v}) \in E(H_k)$.

The measurement (18) can alternatively be written in the form

$$\bigcup_{\vec{v}'} \{\vec{v}'\} \times f(\vec{v}'), \tag{19}$$

where $\vec{v}'$ ranges over $\prod_{i \neq k} e_i$ and it is understood that the second factor of the cartesian product has to be inserted into the kth position of $\vec{v}'$. This measurement can be interpreted as follows: each party $i \neq k$ starts by conducting their measurement e_i. These parties then announce their joint outcome $\vec{v}$ to the remaining party k, who conducts a measurement $f(\vec{v})$ chosen as a function of the previous joint outcome. These hyperedges, hence, impose no-signalling constraints from any single party to the rest.

Definition 6. ***Common FR product*** *[3]*
The common Foulis-Randall product $^{com}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i$ *has vertices*

$$V\left(^{com}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i\right) := \prod_i V(H_i) = V(H_1) \times \ldots \times V(H_n),$$

and its edge set is the union of the edge sets from all the possible iterated binary Foulis-Randall products among H_i.

The hyperedges in the common product have an operational interpretation in terms of *correlated measurements*. A correlated measurement is defined by a fixed order of the parties $i_1, \ldots, i_n$, and a function f_j for each party j, such that the k-th party in the protocol chooses a measurement $e_{i_k} \in E(H_{i_k})$ as a function of the outcomes of the previous parties in the protocol, $e_{i_k} = f_{i_k}(v_{i_1}, \ldots, v_{i_{k-1}})$, obtains an outcome $v_{i_k} \in e_{i_k}$, and communicates it to the remaining $n-k$ parties $i_{k+1}, \ldots i_n$. The common FR product therefore imposes no-signalling constraints across any bipartition of the set of parties.

Finally, before presenting the maximal product, we need to introduce the notion of a measurement protocol [3, 10]:

Definition 7. ***Measurement Protocol*** *[3, 3.3.4]*
Let S be a set of parties. A measurement protocol $\mathcal{P}$ *for S consists of the following data:*

1. *if $S = \emptyset$, the unique protocol is $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$,*
2. *otherwise, the protocol is a triple $\mathcal{P} = (k, e, f)$, where $k \in S$ is a party, $e \in E(H_k)$ is an edge, and f is a function assigning to each vertex $v \in e$ a measurement protocol $f(v)$ on $S \setminus \{k\}$.*

An outcome of a measurement protocol $\mathcal{P}$ for all parties S has exactly one component in each $V(H_i)$ for each $i \in S$, so that it can be regarded as an element of $\prod_{i \in S} V(H_i)$.

Now we can define the maximal FR product:

Definition 8. ***Maximal FR product*** *[3, 3.3.6]*
The maximal Foulis-Randall product $^{\max}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i$ *has vertices $V\left(^{\max}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i\right) := \prod_i V(H_i)$ and set of edges $\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} O(\mathcal{P})$ where $\mathcal{P}$ is a measurement protocol for $\{1, \ldots, n\}$.*

Operationally, each hyperedge in ${}^{\max}\otimes$ has the form of a correlated measurement where the order of the parties is adapted dynamically throughout the protocol [10].

The disjunctive FR product is motivated by Local Orthogonality principle [14]. It is defined as follows: Construct the orthgonality graphs for the individual scenarios. Form the composite orthogonality graph by taking the graphical disjunctive product of the individual graphs. Identify all maximal cliques in the composite orthogonality graph. Each such maximal clique defines a candidate hyperedge e. We accept a candidate hyperedge into the composite scenario if and only if this hyperedge is a linear combination of the normalization hyperedges and the no-signalling equalities, as defined by the normalization and no-signalling matrices introduced in Section 2 of the main text.

Definition 9. ***Disjunctive FR product***

$$E\left({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} H_i\right) = \Big\{ \quad e \quad : \quad \textit{such that both}$$

9a. $e \in \text{MaximalCliques}\left(\text{GraphDisjointUnion}\left(\text{OrthoGraph}(H_1), ..., \text{OrthoGraph}(H_n)\right)\right)$

9b. $\text{rank}(M_{\textit{normalization}} \cup M_{\textit{no-signalling}}) = \text{rank}(e \cup M_{\textit{normalization}} \cup M_{\textit{no-signalling}}) \quad \Big\}$

and where two composite vertices $v_1 = \{v_{A_1}, v_{B_1}\}$ and $v_2 = \{v_{A_2}, v_{B_2}\}$ are adjacent in $\text{GraphDisjunctiveProduct}(G_A, G_B)$ if and only if v_{A_1} is adjacent to v_{A_2} in G_A or v_{B_1} is adjacent to v_{B_2} in G_B (or both). Alternatively, $\text{GraphDisjunctiveProduct}(G_A, G_B) := \text{GraphComplement}(\text{GraphStrongProduct}(\text{GraphComplement}(G_A), \text{GraphComplement}(G_B)))$, where the Strong Product of graphs is more perhaps familiar in information theory.

The disjunctive product relates to the other composition rules as follows:

$$E({}^{\max}\otimes H_i) \subseteq E({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i) \subseteq E(\overline{\otimes H_i}). \tag{20}$$

To see this, first note that every hyperedge in ${}^{\max}\otimes H_i$ is a hyperedge in ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i$. This is a consequence of the fact that every hyperedge in the maximal FR product is a unextendable clique of locally orthogonal events. Those cliques form a subset of those which are admitted into the disjunctive FR product, by virtue of Definition 9a. This also implies that the rank of the matrix representation of the disjunctive FR product is at least as large as that of the maximal FR product. To prove now that the disjuctive FR product has the same completion as the maximal FR product, we need to show the converse, i.e. $\text{rank}(E({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i)) \leq \text{rank}(E({}^{\max}\otimes H_i))$. This follows by Definition 9b, since $\text{rank}(E({}^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i)) = \text{rank}(M_{\text{normalization}} \cup M_{\text{no-signalling}})$, hence justifying Eq. (20). Eq. (5) in the main text is a consequence of Eq. (20) together with the previously established results of Ref. [3].

In addition, notice that the common, maximal and disjunctive FR products all give rise to precisely the same orthogonality conditions, despite giving rise to distinct hypergraphs. The claim is partially justified by Prop. C.2.5 of [3], which states that *whenever* two vertices are locally orthogonal then their composite extensions are also orthogonal in ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$. Definition 9a, on the other hand, ensures that two composite vertices are orthogonal pursuant to ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$ *only* if they are locally orthogonal. This means that there are no orthogonality relations imposed by ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$ beyond those imposed by ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$. This result,



Figure 2: Example of an incomplete contextuality scenarios, i.e. a hypergraph with virtual edges (dashed).

together with the hierarchical relationship between the products per Eq. (5), ensures that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{OrthoGraph}(^{\text{comm}}\otimes H_i) = \text{OrthoGraph}(^{\max}\otimes H_i) = \text{OrthoGraph}(^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i)\\ = \text{GraphDisjointUnion}\left(\text{OrthoGraph}(H_1), ..., \text{OrthoGraph}(H_n)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Finally, we reiterate the critical result of Theorem C.2.4 in Ref. [3], namely that the sets of classical and quantum models remain invariant under the choice of product. Formally,

$$\mathcal{C}(^{\min}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{C}(^{\text{comm}}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{C}(^{\max}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{C}(^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{C}(\overline{\otimes H_i}) \quad \text{and} \tag{22}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(^{\min}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{Q}(^{\text{comm}}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{Q}(^{\max}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{Q}(^{\text{disj}}\otimes H_i) = \mathcal{Q}(\overline{\otimes H_i}). \tag{23}$$

A similar claim follows for the set of general probabilistic models by definition.

D Completion scenario

One proposal for the joint hypergraph of a multipartite contextuality scenario relies on the notion of *completion scenarios*:

Definition 10. ***Completion scenarios*** *[3]*
The completion $\overline{H}$ of a contextuality scenario H has vertex set $V(\overline{H}) := V(H)$, and edge set $E(\overline{H}) := E(H) \cup \{$virtual edges on $H\}$, where a virtual edge $e' \subseteq V(H)$ on H is a subset of vertices with the property that $\sum_{v\in e'} p(v) = 1$.

In words, the completion of a contextuality scenario is constructed by adding as hyperedges each set of vertices that "behave like a measurement" in terms of their probabilities. See Fig. 2 for an example.

It is known that the set of classical, quantum and general probabilitis models do not change under completion, i.e. $\mathcal{C}(\overline{H}) = \mathcal{C}(H)$, $\mathcal{Q}(\overline{H}) = \mathcal{Q}(H)$ and $\mathcal{G}(\overline{H}) = \mathcal{G}(H)$ [3]. In addition, all the multipartite products studied in [3], in particular those presented in the previous section, have the same completion.

In [3] it was conjectured that the completion of a n-fold product scenario can be computed directly in terms of the completions of the individual scenarios via the maximal FR product, namely $\overline{H_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes H_n} \overset{[3,Conj.C.2.6]}{=} {}^{\max}\otimes_{i=1}^{n} \overline{H}_i$. However, the scenario of section 3 is a counterexample of such claim. Indeed, $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{1,m,d}} = \mathcal{B}_{1,m,d}$, but we found that $\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{3,2,2}$ has strictly fewer hyperedges than $\mathcal{B}^{\text{disj}}_{3,2,2}$. This finding, coupled with the hierarchical nature of graph products per Eq. (5), implies that $\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{3,2,2} \neq \overline{\mathcal{B}_{3,2,2}}$. By construction, of course, the extra 64 hyperedges that appear in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{3,2,2}}$ but not in $\mathcal{B}^{\max}_{3,2,2}$ are maximal cliques of locally orthogonal events.

In this work we replace Conjecture C.2.6 of Ref. [3] with Conjecture 1. If Conjecture 1 is true, then Proposition C.1.6(b) of [3] further implies that the $\mathcal{Q}_n$ sets (an infinite family of sets defined in [3], to which $\mathcal{Q}_1$ belongs as a special case) are all invariant among the three explicit local-orthogonality-respecting composition protocols we may consider, ${}^{\text{comm}}\otimes$, ${}^{\max}\otimes$, or ${}^{\text{disj}}\otimes$.

E Violations of Bell inequalities by models in $\mathcal{Q}_1$

In this appendix we present the details on the numerics of Section 3.

We probe the sets $\mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\min}\otimes H_i)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_1({}^{\text{comm}}\otimes H_i)$, where $H_i = \mathcal{B}_{1,2,2}$ for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, by computing their maximum violation of Bell inequalities. The ones that we consider are the 46 inequalities that define the local polytope in the usual $(3,2,2)$ Bell scenario [12]. The results are presented in Table 1. There, we see that inequalities # 10, 23, 25, 31, 32, 35, 41 and 46 display a gap between the bounds obtained for the minimal product and the common product. Therefore, unlike the classical, quantum and general sets of correlations, $\mathcal{Q}_1$ does depend on the choice of multipartite FR product. Moreover, notice that the set of hyperedges of $\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d}$ strictly contains those of the other scenarios, hence $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d}}) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1(\subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\max}_{n,m,d}) = \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\text{comm}}_{n,m,d}) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{B}^{\min}_{n,m,d})$. Our results then imply that the last inclusion is strict.

F $\mathcal{Q}_1$ changes under completion

The question that we explore in this section is whether there exists a contextuality scenario H such that $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{H}) \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}_1(H)$. Indeed, the findings in the previous section show that this is actually the case, by taking $H = \mathcal{B}_{1,2,2} \,{}^{\min}\otimes \mathcal{B}_{1,2,2} \,{}^{\min}\otimes \mathcal{B}_{1,2,2}$.

We therefore shift our focus to try and find a simpler example of the fact. For that, we consider now a CHSH type of scenario, that is two parties, Alice and Bob, each acting locally on a contextuality scenario $H_A = \mathcal{B}_{1,2,2}$ and $H_B = \mathcal{B}_{1,2,2}$. Now define two joint scenarios as follows.

First, the joint scenario $H_1(V,E)$ that has as vertex set and edge set: $V(H_1) := V(H_A) \times V(H_B)$, and

$$E(H_1) = \Big\{\{4,8,12,16\},\{9,13,2,6\},\{3,7,12,16\},\{11,15,4,8\},\\ \{1,9,7,15\},\{5,13,3,11\},\{2,10,8,16\},\{6,14,4,12\}\Big\},$$

# ineq	$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{Q}_1(^{\min}\otimes)$	$\mathcal{Q}_1(^{\text{comm}}\otimes)$	# ineq	$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{Q}_1(^{\min}\otimes)$	$\mathcal{Q}_1(^{\text{comm}}\otimes)$
1	1	1	1	24	7.94011	7.94011	7.94011
2	4	4	4	25	6.82426	6.83125	6.82426
3	2.82843	2.82843	2.82843	26	7.92820	7.92820	7.92820
4	3.65685	3.65685	3.65685	27	6.95466	6.95466	6.95466
5	4.88854	4.88854	4.88854	28	9.90976	9.90976	9.90976
6	4.65685	4.65685	4.65685	29	9.31371	9.31371	9.31371
7	6.66667	6.66667	6.66667	30	9.31371	9.31371	9.31371
8	6.66667	6.66667	6.66667	31	7.80427	7.89009	7.80427
9	5.65685	5.65685	5.65685	32	8.15156	8.15231	8.15156
10	4	4.62546	4	33	9.78985	9.78985	9.78985
11	5.65685	5.65685	5.65685	34	8.25150	8.25150	8.25150
12	5.65685	5.65685	5.65685	35	7.85528	7.94176	7.85528
13	5.65685	5.65685	5.65685	36	9.46143	9.46143	9.46143
14	5.65685	5.65685	5.65685	37	9.31371	9.31371	9.31371
15	6	6	6	38	9.31371	9.31371	9.31371
16	6.12887	6.12887	6.12887	39	9.32534	9.32534	9.32534
17	5.65685	5.65685	5.65685	40	8.12979	8.12979	8.12979
18	5.75379	5.75379	5.75379	41	10.36775	10.41218	10.37347
19	5.78291	5.78291	5.78291	42	13.04705	13.04705	13.04705
20	6.48528	6.48528	6.48528	43	11.31371	11.31371	11.31371
21	5.95546	5.95546	5.95546	44	12.97056	12.97056	12.97056
22	6.19796	6.19796	6.19796	45	12.97056	12.97056	12.97056
23	4.68466	5.13836	4.77536	46	12.98517	13.25619	12.98517

Table 1: Bounds for the 46 facets of the $(3, 2, 2)$ Local Polytope [12] by the quantum set and the set $\mathcal{Q}_1$ for two different choices of multipartite product. Inequalities # 10, 23, 25, 31, 32, 35, 41, and 46 show that $\mathcal{Q}_1(^{\min}\otimes)$ strictly contains $\mathcal{Q}_1(^{\text{comm}}\otimes)$.

where the number labels of the vertices in $V(H_1)$ is given by

$$(ab|xy) \rightarrow 8 * a + 4 * b + 2 * x + y + 1,$$

with $a, b, x, y \in \{0, 1\}$.

Second, the joint scenario $H_2 = {H_A}^{\mathrm{FR}} \otimes H_B$. The edge set is explicitely

$$\begin{aligned} E(H_2) = \Big\{ & \{4,8,12,16\}, \{9,13,2,6\}, \{3,7,12,16\}, \{11,15,4,8\}, \{1,9,7,15\}, \\ & \{5,13,3,11\}, \{2,10,8,16\}, \{6,14,4,12\}, \{1,5,9,13\}, \{2,6,10,14\}, \\ & \{3,7,11,15\}, \{1,5,10,14\} \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $E(H_1) \subset E(H_2)$.

From these definitions, one can check that H_1 and H_2 have the same completion since $\mathrm{rref}(E(H_1)) = \mathrm{rref}(E(H_2))$.

Therefore, for the sake of the example take $H = H_1$, whose completion is $\overline{H} = H_2$. Consider now the Bell inequality given by [8, 13]

$$\begin{aligned} & \tfrac{30}{31} p_A(0|0) - \tfrac{167}{9} p_A(0|1) - \tfrac{167}{9} p_B(0|0) + \tfrac{30}{31} p_B(0|1) + \tfrac{174}{11} p_{AB}(00|00) \\ & \quad + \tfrac{244}{23} p_{AB}(00|10) - \tfrac{74}{11} p_{AB}(00|01) + \tfrac{174}{11} p_{AB}(00|11) \leq 0.9677\,. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Correlations in $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{H})$ achieve a maximum value of 1.02325, whereas those in $\mathcal{Q}_1(H)$ reach 1.15324. Therefore, $\mathcal{Q}_1(\overline{H}) \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}_1(H)$.